



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/645,037	08/21/2003	Janani Janakiraman	AUS920030511US1	7340
35525	7590	05/10/2007		
IBM CORP (YA) C/O YEE & ASSOCIATES PC P.O. BOX 802333 DALLAS, TX 75380			EXAMINER ALBERTALLI, BRIAN LOUIS	
			ART UNIT 2626	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 05/10/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/645,037

Applicant(s)

JANAKIRAMAN ET AL.

Examiner

Brian L. Albertalli

Art Unit

2626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

1. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

2. Claims 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 16-20 are directed to "A computer program product, in a computer readable medium". However computer readable mediums are defined by the specification as including "transmission-type media, such as digital and analog communications links, wired or wireless communications links using transmission forms, such as, for example, radio frequency and light wave transmissions". These are examples of "signals", per se, and are non-statutory. That is, a signal, as a form of energy, does not fall within one of the four statutory categories of invention (a process, machine, composition of matter, or manufacture).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-3, 6, 7, 11, 12, 16, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Davis et al. (U.S. Patent 5,432,948).

In regard to claims 1, 11, and 16, Davis et al. disclose a method, apparatus, and computer program product for transliteration of text in Indian languages (Devanagari, column 11, lines 57-61 and column 12, lines 55-56), the method comprising:

identifying a selected portion of a text in an Indian language (a range of text, column 6, lines 56-64; as noted above, Indian languages are supported) and

transliterating the selected portion into a target script to form transliterated text, wherein the target script is identified in a user profile (the source characters are transliterated to target characters, column 7, lines 59-61; the transliteration being based on a set of rules which are created by the user, i.e. a "user profile", column 5, lines 6-15 and Fig. 5).

In regard to claim 2, Davis et al. disclose the step of identifying a selected portion of a text includes receiving a selection from a user (Fig. 6, a user selects a label 610 for transliteration to label 680, column 10, lines 5-10).

In regard to claim 3, Davis et al disclose the selected portion is delimited by at least one of spaces, punctuation, and document tags (see Fig. 6, spaces after label 610).

In regard to claim 6, Davis et al. disclose replacing the selected portion with the transliterated text within the text (in range operation, the source text is replaced, column 7, lines 59-61).

In regard to claims 7, 12, and 17, Davis et al. disclose presenting the transliterated text (see Fig. 6, label 680 and column 10, lines 5-10).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis et al., in view of Microsoft (*Computer Dictionary*).

Davis et al. do not disclose the method is performed in a web browser plug-in.

Microsoft discloses a web browser plug-in allows a web browser to execute programs embedded in HTML documents that the browser would not normally recognize for, e.g., proprietary software.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Davis et al. to perform as a web browser plug-in, because this would allow for the transliteration of World Wide Web documents. This method of transliteration would be advantageous in a WWW type environment, because users of a

web browser have access to web pages from around the world and transliteration would allow a user to interpret a web page in a script/language not supported by their browser.

7. Claims 8-10, 13-15, and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis et al., in view of Miyao et al. (U.S. Patent 4,774,666).

In regard to claims 8, 13, and 18, Davis et al. do not disclose identifying one or more synonyms of the selected portion.

Miyao et al. disclose a method, apparatus, and computer program product for identifying one or more synonyms of a selected portion of text (Fig. 12(b) a candidate is selected to identify synonyms of the selected candidate, column 7, lines 31-51 and Abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Davis et al. to identify one or more synonyms of the selected portion, because this would allow a user to select the most appropriate term for the selected text.

In regard to claims 9, 10, 14, 15, 19, and 20, Davis et al. disclose transliterating any selected text and presenting the transliterated text (column 10, lines 5-10).

Thus, in the combination of Davis et al. and Miyao et al. outlined above with respect to claims 8, 13, and 18, the selected synonyms would also be transliterated and displayed once a synonym had been selected by the user.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. *Transliteration of Indic Scripts* is a website available by 2002 that explains Indic transliteration standards. Sinha et al. (*A Modular Data Terminal for Indian Languages*) disclose a composition processor for transliterating between Indian languages. Mani et al. (U.S. Patent 7,177,794) disclose a system for transliterating between Indian languages. Kang (U.S. Patent 6,810,374) disclose a transliteration system that allows users to select a portion of text to be transliterated.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian L. Albertalli whose telephone number is (571) 272-7616. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri, 8:00 AM - 5:30 PM, every second Fri off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Hudspeth can be reached on (571) 272-7843. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2626

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

BLA 5/3/07



DAVID HUDSPETH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600